

## Message Text

PAGE 01 VIENNA 02845 01 OF 06 090946 Z

20

ACTION MBFR-03

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 IO-12 ADP-00 CIAE-00 PM-09 H-02 INR-10

L-03 NSAE-00 NSC-10 PA-03 RSC-01 PRS-01 SS-15 USIA-12

NEA-10 GAC-01 TRSE-00 SAJ-01 OIC-04 AEC-11 ACDA-19

OMB-01 RSR-01 INRE-00 NIC-01 AECE-00 /156 W  
----- 015726

P R 090810 Z APR 73

FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 8375

INFO SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY HELSINKI

AMEMBASSY LONDON

AMEMBASSY MOSCOW

USMISSION NATO

USNMR SHAPE

USLOSACLANT

USCINCEUR

USDOCOSOUTH

USDEL SALT TWO II

USMISSION GENEVA

S E C R E T SECTION 1 OF 6 VIENNA 2845

E.9 O. 11652 GDS

TAGS: PARM

SUBJ: MBFR: APRIL 6 DISCUSSION BETWEEN NETHERLANDS AND US  
REPS AND SOVIET AND HUNGARIAN REPS ON HUNGARIAN ISSUE

GENEVA FOR DISTO

ALL OTHER MBFR CAPITALS BY POUCH

FROM US REP MBFR

1. BEGIN SUMMARY: CONTINUED DISCUSSION OF HUNGARIAN ISSUE  
SECRET

PAGE 02 VIENNA 02845 01 OF 06 090946 Z

AFTERNOON OF APRIL 6 WAS AGAIN INCONCLUSIVE, ALTHOUGH COMPARATIVE  
DRAFTING PROCESS ON MAJOR POINTS AT ISSUE WAS STARTED BY MEANS OF

A THREE- COLUMN APPROACH. FIRST HOUR OF SESSION WAS DEVOTED TO HOLDING THE EASTERN REPRESENTATIVES TO AGREEMENT MADE IN THE APRIL 5 DISCUSSION TO GIVE EQUAL TREATMENT TO DIFFERING TEXTS ON PARTICIPATION. EASTERN REPS FIRST REFUSED DISCUSS PROPOSED COMPLEMENTARY STATEMENTS ON HUNGARY AND THEN DECLINED TO DISCUSS THEM BEFORE ENLARGEMENT FORMULA PROPOSED BY THE EAST WAS ADDRESSED, AND IT TOOK A FULL HOUR OF HAMMERING TO BRING THEM TO AGREE TO SUGGESTION BY THE ALLIED REPS THAT SEQUENCE OF DISCUSSION BE DETERMINED BY LOT. SUBSEQUENT DISCUSSION FOCUSED ON COMPLEMENTARY STATEMENTS, ENLARGEMENT FORMULA, AND DEFINITION OF DIRECT PARTICIPATIONS. EASTERN REPS REFUSED TO OFFER TEXTUAL AMENDMENTS TO COMPLEMENTARY STATEMENTS BY HUNGARY AND ALLIED SIDE ON HUNGARIAN PARTICIPATION ISSUE PROPOSED BY ALLIED REPS, BUT HUNGARIAN REP USTOR SUBMITTED BRIEF WRITTEN STATEMENT OF OWN. ALLIED REPS SAID THAT, WHILE THEY COULD AGREE THAT EASTERN SIDE MIGHT NOT BE PREPARED TO ADDRESS TEXT OF PROPOSED STATEMENTS IN THIS SESSION IN A SPECIFIC WAY, THEY WOULD INSIST THAT STATEMENTS BE DISCUSSED IN CONSTRUCTIVE MANNER IN SUBSEQUENT DISCUSSIONS. ALLIED REPS SUBMITTED ALTERNATE ENLARGEMENT PHRASING EMPHASIZING CENTRAL EUROPEAN NATURE OF DIRECT PARTICIPANTS, AND THAT STATUS IN PRESENT TALKS NON-PREJUDICIAL FOR FUTURE. EASTERN REPS DISPUTED BOTH CHANGES, ARGUING THAT THEY WERE INTENDED TO GIVE UNILATERAL ADVANTAGE TO THE WESTERN SIDE, AND IN PARTICULAR OPPOSING THE FORCES OR TERRITORY IN CENTRAL EUROPE TERMINOLOGY, BUT IN CONTRAST TO SOVIETS, USTOR SHOWED INTEREST IN SECOND FORMULATION ON NON-PREJUDICIAL CHARACTER OF STATUS IN PRESENT TALKS. ALLIED REPS SUBMITTED REVISED LANGUAGE FOR LEAD SENTENCE OF SECOND PARAGRAPH, DEFINING DIRECT PARTICIPANTS AS THOSE WITH FORCES OR TERRITORY IN CENTRAL EUROPE WHICH MAY DECIDE TO PARTICIPATE IN POSSIBLE MEASURES RELATED TO CENTRAL EUROPE. EASTERN REPS CHALLENGED THIS FORMULATION ON THE GROUNDS THAT IT LEFT OPEN THE QUESTION OF WHO WERE DIRECT OR INDIRECT PARTICIPANTS. NEXT SESSION IS SCHEDULED FOR AFTERNOON APRIL 9, ALTHOUGH THERE MAY BE LUNCH BETWEEN NETHERLANDS AND US REP AND SOVIETS APRIL 7. END SUMMARY.

2. DISCUSSION OF HUNGARIAN ISSUE TOOK PLACE IN NETHERLANDS EMBASSY AFTERNOON OF APRIL 6, WITH NETHERLANDS AND US REPS PRESENT ON THE ALLIED SIDE, SOVIET REPS KHLESTOV, KVITSINSKIY, AND TIMERBAYEV AND HUNGARIAN REPS, USTOR AND PETRAN.

SECRET

PAGE 03 VIENNA 02845 01 OF 06 090946 Z

3. NETHERLANDS REP BEGAN DISCUSSION BY REFERRING TO FIRST PARAGRAPH OF PROCEDURES TEXT CIRCULATED AT APRIL 5 SESSION BY SOVIET REPRESENTATIVES. NOTING THAT ALLIED REPS HAD ASKED ON THAT OCCASION FOR EASTERN ELUCIDATION ON THE PHRASE " RELATED TO CENTRAL EUROPE," AND THAT EASTERN REPS HAD AGREED TO GIVE SUCH ELUCIDATION AT A LATER TIME, HE ASKED IF THE EASTERN REPS WERE PREPARED TO DO SO NOW.

4. KHLESTOV REPLIED BY SAYING THAT HIS UNDERSTANDING OF THE

PREVIOUS SESSION WAS THAT IT ENDED IN AGREEMENT TO CONCENTRATE DURING THE NEXT DISCUSSION ON MAJOR POINTS AT ISSUE, I. E., THOSE IN PARAGRAPH 2 AND 3.

ALLIED REPS AGREED THAT, IF EASTERN SIDE WERE NOT PREPARED TO COMMENT ON FIRST PARAGRAPH, THIS SEQUENCE COULD INDEED BE FOLLOWED, ALTHOUGH EASTERN REPS SHOULD BEAR IN MIND THAT THE ALLIED SPOKESMEN WILL WISH TO HAVE CLARIFICATION ON THE FIRST PARAGRAPH IN DUE COURSE. THE NETHERLANDS REP THEN COMMENTED ON THE LIST OF NAMES OF THE 19 PARTICIPATING STATES INCORPORATED IN THE SOVIET TEXT OF APRIL 5. HE POINTED OUT THAT, SINCE THE DESIGNATION " FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY" ENDED IN THE LETTER "6" IT SHOULD BE PLACED ACCORDING TO ALPHABETIC SEQUENCE AFTER THE GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC. HE ADDED THAT, IF DESIGNATION WERE IN FRENCH AS WAS THE CASE IN HELSINKI, THE OPPOSITE ORDER WOULD APPLY. KHLESTOV ASKED THAT THE QUESTION BE DEFERRED FOR LATER DISCUSSION. KVITSINSKIY ADDED THAT SUCH SEQUENCE MIGHT BE POSSIBLE BUT IN THAT CASE WOULD REQUIRE OMISSION OF REFERENCE TO ALPHABETICAL ORDER IN PARA 4 OF SOVIET DRAFT.

5. THE NETHERLANDS REP THEN NOTED AGREEMENT REACHED IN THE PRECEDING SESSION THAT WORK SHOULD PROCEED ON THE MOST CONTENTIOUS ASPECTS OF THE PARTICIPATION ISSUE ON THE BASIS OF A THREE- COLUMN DRAFTING EXERCISE CONDUCTED ON SEPARATE SHEETS. HE SAID THAT THE ALLIED REPS WERE READY TO BEGIN THIS PROCESS NOW, FOCUSING ON THE EASTERN ENLARGEMENT FORMULA AND THE COMPLEMENTARY STATEMENTS ON THE HUNGARIAN ISSUE PROPOSED BY THE ALLIED SIDE. HE REMINDED THE EASTERN REPS OF MUTUAL AGREEMENT REACHED APRIL 5 THAT BOTH OF THESE SUBJECTS SHOULD RECEIVE EQUAL TREATMENT, AND SHOULD BE DISCUSSED IN PARALLEL. HE THEN SUGGESTED THAT THE ORDER OF

SECRET

ADP000

PAGE 01 VIENNA 02845 02 OF 06 091002 Z

20

ACTION MBFR-03

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 IO-12 ADP-00 CIAE-00 PM-09 H-02 INR-10

L-03 NSAE-00 NSC-10 PA-03 RSC-01 PRS-01 SS-15 USIA-12

NEA-10 GAC-01 TRSE-00 SAJ-01 OIC-04 AEC-11 ACDA-19

OMB-01 RSR-01 NIC-01 INRE-00 AECE-00 /156 W

----- 015821

P R 090810 Z APR 73

FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 8376

INFO SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY HELSINKI

AMEMBASSY LONDON

AMEMBASSY MOSCOW  
USMISSION NATO  
USNMR SHAPE  
USLOSACLANT  
USCINCEUR  
USDOCOSOUTH  
USDEL SALT TWO  
USMISSION GENEVA

S E C R E T SECTION 2 OF 6 VIENNA 2845

DISTO

ALL OTHER MBFR CAPITALS BY POUCH; FROM US REP MBFR

DISCUSSION OF THESE TWO TOPICS BE DETERMINED BY CHANCE, THROUGHT  
TOSSING A COIN.

6. KHESTOV REPLIED THAT IT WAS HIS UNDERSTANDING THAT THERE  
HAD BEEN AGREEMENT AT THE PRECEDING SESSION THAT SUBSEQUENT WORK  
SHOULD FOCUS ON TWO CONTENTIOUS POINTS, BOTH IN PARAGRAPH 2. THE  
FIRST WAS A DISPUTED SENTENCE DEFINING DIRECT PARTICIPANTS AS THOSE  
WHO WOULD BE POTENTIAL PARTICIPANTS IN POSSIBLE AGREEMENTS ON  
REDUCTION OF ARMED FORCES AND ARMAMENTS IN CENTRAL EUROPE; THE  
SECRET

PAGE 02 VIENNA 02845 02 OF 06 091002 Z

SECOND WAS THE ENLARGEMENT FORMULA. HE SAID THAT THE EASTERN SIDE  
STILL DID NOT HAVE SPECIFIC ALLIED COMMENTS OR PREFERRED TEXTS ON  
THESE TWO POINTS, AND ASKED THE ALLIES TO PRODUCE THESE SO THAT  
A TEXTUAL COMPARISON COULD BE MADE.

7. THE NETHERLANDS REP REPLIED THAT THE ALLIED SPOKESMEN HAD  
MADE CLEAR DURING THE APRIL 5 SESSION THAT THEY WOULD INDEED HAVE  
TEXTUAL COMMENTS TO PROPOSE ON THESE POINTS, BUT ONLY ON THE BASIS  
OF AN EQUAL AND PARALLEL DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED STATEMENTS ON  
THE HUNGARIAN ISSUE. THE ALLIED WOULD BE PREPARED TO COMMENT ON THE  
SOVIET ENLARGEMENT FORMULA, BUT ONLY IF THE EASTERN REPS WOULD  
RESPECT THEIR AGREEMENT OF THE PREVIOUS DAY TO GIVE CONSIDERED  
OPINIONS ON THE STATEMENTS PROPOSED BY THE ALLIES, WHICH  
THE ALLIED REPS CONSIDERED AN EQUITABLE SOLUTION FOR THE ISSUE OF  
HUNGARIAN PARTICIPATION. HE UNDERScoreD THAT THESE STATEMENTS  
WOULD NO BE WISHED AWAY, ND MUST BE PUT ON THE TABLE FOR PRIOR  
DISCUSSION AND DRAFTING. IT WAS TO EASE DISCUSSION OF THIS AND  
OTHER CONTENTIOUS ISSUES THAT THE ALLIED REPS HAD PROPOSED THE  
USE OF SEPARATE SHEETS OF PAPER FOR A DRAFTING EXERCISE. HE AGAIN  
SUGGESTED THAT THE SEQUENCE OF DISCUSSION BE DECIDED BY HAZARD.

8. THE UNGARIAN REP SAID IT WAS HIS RECOLLECTION THAT THERE WAS  
AGREEMENT DURING THE PREVIOUS SESSION ON THE DIFFERENT NATURE AND  
STATUS OF AN ENLARGEMENT FORMULA AND POSSIBLE STATEMENTS, AS WELL  
AS AGREEMENT BY THE ALLIED REPS TO COMMENT ON THE ENLARGEMENT

FORMULA. THE US REP REPLIED THAT THERE HAD BEEN NOT AGREEMENT ON A DIFFERENT STATUS FOR THESE TWO ITEMS, AND THAT IT HAD BEEN AGREED THAT THEY WOULD ENJOY EQUAL STATUS IN DISCUSSION AND IN THE COMMON EFFORT TO FIND A COMPROMISE.

9. KHLESTOV SAID THAT THE ENLARGEMENT FORMULA HAD BEEN BORN IN THE PROCESS OF MUTUAL DISCUSSION AND WAS A NEUTRAL APPROACH TO A COMMON PROBLEM WHICH TOOK ACCOUNT OF THE INTERESTES OF BOTH SIDES; THE SOVIET SIDE HAD NOT CREATED THIS APPROACH -- IT HAD MERELY SOUGHT TO RECORD ON PAPER WHAT HAD BEEN JOINTLY DISCUSSED. IN THIS CONTEXT, HE WOULD LIKE TO KNOW WHAT THE ALLIED VIEW WAS ON THIS FORMULA. THE US REP SAID THAT, SO FAR, THE TRAIN OF THOUGHT AT THE PRESENT MEETING HAD BEEN EXPLORED IN DETAIL THE DAY BEFORE, AND HE HAD THE IMPRESSION THAT THERE WOULD BE AGREEMENT THAT BOTH THE ENLARGEMENT FORMULA AND THE COMPLEMENTARY STATEMENTS ON HUNGARIAN PARTICIPATION WOULD BE TEMPORARILY TREATED AS ITEMS WIHT-OUT STATUS FOR THE SAKE OF EQUAL AND APRALLEL ELABORATION BY ALL  
SECRET

PAGE 03 VIENNA 02845 02 OF 06 091002 Z

PARTICIPANTS IN THE DISCUSSION. IN THIS SENSE, THEY COULD BE ADDRESSED SOLELY ON THE BASIS OF THEIR SUBSTANTIVE CONTENT AND NOT ON THEIR POSSIBLE PLACE IN AN EVENTUAL PROCEDURES PAPER. THIS WAS A BUSINESSLIKE APPROACH, AND IF THE TOSSING OF A COIN SHOWED THAT THE EASTERN FORMULA SHOULD BE DISCUSSED FIRST, THE ALLIED REPS WOULD BE GLAD TO ADDRESS IT.

10. KHLESTOV SAID THAT IT WAS OBVIOUS THAT IN THE COMPARISON OF ANY TEXTS THAT WOULD BE PART OF A PROCEDURAL DOCUMENT IT WAS NECESSARY TO HAVE DIFFERENT TEXTS TO COMPARE. THE EASTERN SIDE HAD WRITTEN DOWN AN ENLARGEMENT FORMULA AND GIVEN THIS TO THE ALLIED REPS, BUT HAD YET TO SEE ALLIED COMMENTS ON THE TEXT. THE ALLIED REPS, ON THE OTHER HAND, HAD GIVEN THEIR PROPOSALS TO THE EASTERN SIDE, AND THE EASTERN REPS HAD MADE THEIR REACTION CLEAR -- THERE SHOULD BE NO SUCH STATEMENTS. IN CONSEQUENCE, IT WAS NOT POSSIBLE TO ENGAGE IN COMPARATIVE DRAFTING ON A TEXT THE COUNTERPART TO WHICH WAS THE VIEW THAT THERE SHOULD BE NOT TEXT. WHY WERE THEALLIED REPS SO RETICENT TO GIVE THEIR SPECIFC COMMENTS ON THE ENLARGEMENT FORMUL? WHAT WERE THEY HIDING?

11. THE US REP REITERATED THAT ON APRIL 5 THERE HAD BEEN AGREE-MENT TO USE A THREE- COLUMN APPROACH TO TOW MAJOR POINTS AT ISSUE, AND HE ASSUMED THAT THE EASTERN SIDE WAS STILL WILLING TO ABIDE BY THEIR AGREEMENT ON THIS POINT. KVITSINSKIY SAID THAT THERE HAD BEEN AGREEMENT TO SEPARATE THESE POINTS TEMPORARILY FROM THE TEXT OF A PROCEDURES PAPER, BUT NO AGREEMENT THAT THEY SHOULD HAVE EQUAL STATUS. THE US REP REPLIED THAT THE PRESENT ISSUE WAS NOT EVENTUAL STATUS IN A PROCEDURES DOCUMENT -- THIS WHOLE ISSUE WAS BEING LEFT ASIDE FOR THE MOMENT AS REGARDS BOTH THE PROPOSED STATEMENT AND THE PROPOSED ENLARGEMENT FORMULA -- BUT EQUAL TREAT-MEN  
SECRET

PAGE 01 VIENNA 02845 03 OF 06 091037 Z

10

ACTION MBFR-03

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 IO-12 ADP-00 CIAE-00 PM-09 H-02 INR-10

L-03 NSAE-00 NSC-10 PA-03 RSC-01 PRS-01 SS-15 USIA-12

NEA-10 GAC-01 TRSE-00 SAJ-01 OIC-04 AEC-11 ACDA-19

OMB-01 RSR-01 NIC-01 INRE-00 AECE-00 /156 W

----- 016105

P R 090810 Z APR 73

FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 8377

INFO SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY HELSINK

AMEMBASSY LONDON

AMEMBASSY MOSCOW

USMISSION NATO

USNMR/ SHAPE

USLOSACLANT

USCINCEUR

USDOCOSOUTH

USDEL SALT TWO II

USMISSION GENEVA

S E C R E T SECTION 3 OF 6 VIENNA 2845

12. THE US REP STATED THAT THE EASTERN REPRESENTATIVES SHOULD HAVE NO ILLUSIONS -- THE ALLIED REPS EXPECTED THEM TO PRODUCE A SERIOUS COMMENT ON THE ALLIED PROPOSED STATEMENTS ON HUNGARY, IN KEEPING WITH AGREEMENT REACHED IN PREVIOUS DISCUSSION. IF THE EASTERN SIDE WAS NOT PREPARED TO PRODUCE A FULL TEXT OF STATEMENTS IN A FORM ACCEPTABLE TO THEM ON THE PRESENT OCCASION, WE WOULD COME BACK TO

THE SUBJECT AGAIN, BUT BOTH THE ENLARGEMENT FORMULA AND THE STATEMENTS WOULD HAVE TO BE DEVELOPED IN A PARALLEL PROCESS - NO PROGRESS ON ONE, NO PROGRESS ON THE OTHER. KHLESTOV SAID THAT THE EASTERN REPS HAD HOPED TO SEE A PARALLEL ALLIED PAPER COMMENTING ON THEIR ENLARGEMENT FORMULA, BUT THE ALLIED REPS SEEMED TO BE HIDING SUCH A PAPER. THE NETHERLANDS REP UNDERSCORED THAT THE TWO ITEMS WHICH SHOULD BOTH BE ADDRESSED IN SECRET

PAGE 02 VIENNA 02845 03 OF 06 091037 Z

COMPARATIVE DRAFTING WERE NOT NECESSARILY COMPETITIVE BUT WERE SIMILAR IN FUNCTION AND SHOULD BE TREATED EQUALLY.

13. TIMERBAYEV VENTURED A " PERSONAL SUGGESTION" THAT THE ALLIES

GIVE THEIR TEXTUAL IDEAS ON THE TWO DISPUTED POINTS IN PARAGRAPH 2 AS RECORDED IN THE SOVIET VERSION OF APRIL 5, AS WELL AS ON ANY OTHER PARTS OF THIS PARAGRAPH ( I. E., STATEMENTS ON HUNGARY). THEN BOTH SIDES COULD BEGIN TO DISCUSS TEXTS, EACH SIDE DISCUSSING THE ITEMS IT FELT PREPARED TO ADDRESS. AS ONE SIDE GAVE ITS VIEWS, THE OTHER SIDE COULD TAKE NOTES. IN THIS WAY, A FORM OF COMPARATIVE DRAFTING COULD TAKE PLACE. THE US REP POINTED OUT THAT TIMERBAYEV HIMSELF HAD ON THE PREVIOUS DAY CHARACTERIZED SUCH A PROCEDURE AS RETROGRESSING FROM THE IDEA OF A REAL EFFORT AT COMPARATIVE DRAFTING. THE NETHERLANDS REP POINTED OUT THAT THIS SUGGESTION WOULD NOT ENTAIL THE EASTERN AND ALLIED TEXTS BEING GIVEN EQUIVALENT TREATMENT, AND SAID THAT THE ALLIED REPS WISHED TO HAVE ASSURANCES OF SUCH TREATMENT, MEANING EASTERN COMMENTS ON THE STATEMENTS PROPOSED BY THE ALLIES. THE US REP REPEATED THAT THERE HAD BEEN AGREEMENT TO THIS GENERAL WAY OF PROCEEDING AT THE PREVIOUS SESSION.

14. KVITSINSKIY SAID THAT SINCE THE EASTERN POSITION WAS THAT THERE SHOULD BE 8 INDIRECT PARTICIPATNS AND SINCE THIS REFLECTED REALITIES, HE SAW NO POSSIBLE ADVANTAGE FOR THE ALLIED REPS IN PURSUING THE IDEA OF COMPLEMENTARY STATEMENTS ON THE FUTURE PARTICIPATION OF HUNGARY. IT APPEARED TO HIM THAT WHAT THE ALLIED REPS WERE REALLY SEEKING WAS AN ENLARGEMENT FORMULA. IN THIS CASE, THE ENLARGEMENT FORMULA IN THE EASTERN EXT OFFERED ADVANTAGES TO BOTH SIDES. THE US REP REPLIED THAT IF THE EASTERN SIDE WISHED TO VIEW THE STATEMENTS ON HUNGARY PROPOSED BY THE ALLIES AS A VARIANT OF THE ENLARGEMENT FORMULA, THEY WERE WELCOME TO DO SO AS LONG AS BOTH RECEIVED EQUAL TREATMENT. THE QUESTION NOW WAS ONE OF EQUAL TREATMENT FOR PAPERS WHOSE STATUS IN A PROCEDURES PAPER REMAINED TO BE DETERMINED. KVITSINSKIY SAID THAT THE ALLIED REPS SHOULD REST ASSURED THAT THEIR STATEMENTS WOULD NOT BE INCLUDED AS PART OF A PROCEDURES TEXT. THE US REP REPLIED THAT THE PRESENT ISSUE WAS NOT WHERE EITHER STATEMENTS ON HUNGARY OR A POSSIBLE ENLARGEMENT FORMULA WOULD FIGURE IN THE TEXT, BUT RATHER A SERIOUS CONSIDERATION OF THE CONTENT OF BOTH. KHLESTOV SAID THAT THE EASTERN REPS WERE WAITING TO SEE THE VIEWS OF THE ALLIED REPS IN WRITING ON THE ENLARGEMENT FORMULA. THE ALLIED REPS REPLIED THAT THEY WOULD READILY PRODUCE THIS AS SOON AS  
SECRET

PAGE 03 VIENNA 02845 03 OF 06 091037 Z

THEY WERE CONFIDENT THAT BOTH THE STATEMENTS AND THE ENLARGEMENT FORMULA WOULD RECEIVE EQUAL TREATMENT.

15. AFTER CONSIDERABLE FURTHER EXCHANGES ALONG THESE LINES, THE QUESTION OF ORDER OF DISCUSSION WAS DECIDED BY CHANCE, WITH THE COMPLEMENTARY STATEMENTS ON HUNGARY COMING OUT AS THE FIRST ITEM

SECRET

PAGE 01 VIENNA 02845 04 OF 06 091044 Z

20

ACTION MBFR-03

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 IO-12 ADP-00 CIAE-00 PM-09 H-02 INR-10

L-03 NSAE-00 NSC-10 PA-03 RSC-01 PRS-01 SS-15 USIA-12

NEA-10 GAC-01 TRSE-00 SAJ-01 OIC-04 AEC-11 ACDA-19

OMB-01 RSR-01 NIC-01 INRE-00 AECE-00 /156 W  
----- 016133

P R 090810 Z APR 73

FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 8378

INFO SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY HELSINKI

AMEMBASSY LONDON

AMEMBASSY MOSCOW

USMISSION NATO

USNMR SHAPE

USLOSACLANT

USCINCEUR

USDOCOSOUTH

USDEL SALT TWO

USMISSION GENEVA

S E C R E T SECTION 4 OF 6 VIENNA 2845

DISTO

ALL OTHER MBFR CAPITALS BY POUCH; FROM US REP MBFR

LEFT THE ENTIRE ISSUE OPEN WITHOUT PREJUDICE TO THE INTERESTS OF EITHER SIDE. THE NETHERLANDS REP CONCLUDED BY SAYING THAT THESE COMPLEMENTARY STATEMENTS COULD ALSO TAKE THE FORM OF A SINGLE AGREED STATEMENT, BUT IN ANY CASE WERE CONCEIVED AS A NEUTRAL WAY OF LEAVING HUNGARY IN ABAYANCE, LEAVING THE DECISION OF ITS FUTURE PARTICIPATION WHOLLY OPEN FOR THE FUTURE IN LIGHT OF FUTURE CIRCUMSTANCES, AND REPRESENTING A FAIR APPROACH WHICH TOOK INTO ACCOUNT THE INTERESTS OF BOTH SIDES.

SECRET

PAGE 02 VIENNA 02845 04 OF 06 091044 Z

18. THE HUNGARIAN REP, ALFTER EXAMINING THE TEXT OF THE STATEMENT AND LISTENING TO THE REMARKS OF THE NETHERLANDS REP, SAID THAT IT WAS THE CUSTOM IN THE PRESENT DISCUSSIONS NOT TO USE CERTAIN STRONG ADJECTIVES -- THUS HE WOULD SAY THAT THE STATEMENTS REPRESENTED A FUTILE EXERCISE RATHER THAN CALLING THEM UNACCEPTABLE. HE SAID THAT HE HAD STUDIED THE TEXT BEFORE, HAD REFLECTED ON IT, AND HAD EARLIER SAID THAT IT WAS NOT A PRODUCTIVE ROUTE TO FOLLOW. IT WAS



NOT A NEUTRAL TEXT, DID NOT TAKE ACCOUNT OF THE VIEWS OF SOCIALIST COUNTRIES, SINGLED OUT HUNGARY AS A FUTURE PARTICIPANT IN AGREEMENTS, AND ASKED THE HUNGARIAN REP TO MAKE STATEMENTS WHICH HE SIMPLY DOES NOT WANT TO MAKE. IN SHORT, ALL OF THIS WAS NOT A CONSTRUCTIVE CONTRIBUTION TO THE PRESENT SERIES OF DISCUSSIONS. THE HUNGARIAN VIEW WAS THAT THERE WAS NO NEED FOR A STATEMENT ON HUNGARY, AT LEAST NOT FOR STATEMENTS OF THIS KIND. IF, ON THE OTHER HAND, THE ALLIES WISHED TO REVERSE THE MATTER AND MAKE A STATEMENT ON THEIR OWN RESERVING THEIR RIGHT TO RAISE THE QUESTION OF HUNGARY'S PARTICIPATION IN FUTURE AGREEMENTS, THIS WOULD BE POSSIBLE, ALTHOUGH SUCH A STATEMENT WOULD NOT BE CONSIDERED BINDING, AND THE SOCIALIST STATES WOULD IN TURN RESERVE THE RIGHT TO INVITE ITALY TO PARTICIPATE. USTOR THEN SAID THAT HE HAD ENVISAGED THAT THE ALLIED REPRESENTATIVES MIGHT, ON THIS OCCASION, WISH TO RESURRECT THE SAME STATEMENTS THAT THEY HAD SERVED UP BEFORE, AND AS A RESULT HE WAS PREPARED WITH A BRIEF STATEMENT OF HIS OWN. USTOR THEN CIRCULATED THE FOLLOWING TEXT.

19. BEGIN TEXT: THE DELEGATIONS OF THE SOCIALIST COUNTRIES CONSIDER THAT THERE SHOULD NOT BE EITHER STATEMENTS AS PROPOSED BY THE WESTERN DELEGATIONS OR ANY OTHER STATEMENTS.

IN THE EVENT THAT THE WESTERN DELEGATIONS WILL MAKE A UNILATERAL STATEMENT TO THE EFFECT THAT THEY RESERVE THEIR RIGHT TO RAISE AGAIN THE QUESTION OF THE PARTICIPATION OF HUNGARY, THE DELEGATION OF HUNGARY WILL STATE THAT THE SOCIALIST COUNTRIES WILL NOT BE BOUND BY SUCH A STATEMENT AND WILL RESERVE THEIR RIGHT TO RAISE AGAIN THE QUESTION OF THE PARTICIPATION OF ITALY. END TEXT.

20. THE NETHERLANDS REP ASKED IF THIS MEANT THAT THERE WOULD BE NO SERIOUS ATTEMPT AT TEXTUAL COMMENT BY THE EASTERN SIDE. THE HUNGARIAN REP REPLIED THAT SUCH COMMENT, AND THE PAPER HE HAD JUST CIRCULATED COULD BE SUMMARIZED BY PUTTING DOWN THE WORD "ZERO" IN THE BLANK COLUMN OF THE DRAFTING AID CIRCULATED BY THE ALLIED REPS. US REP SAID THAT AMBASSADOR USTOR'S RESPONSE WAS NOT A SURPRISING ONE,  
SECRET

PAGE 03 VIENNA 02845 04 OF 06 091044 Z

BUT ALSO SIMPLY NOT ADEQUATE. IT CONFORMED NEITHER TO THE NEEDS NOR THE REALITIES OF THE PRESENT SITUATION.

21. THE HUNGARIAN REP SAID THAT IN THE EASTERN VIEW THE ENLARGEMENT FORMULA WAS FULLY ADEQUATE FOR THE PRESENT SITUATION. IF ONE ASSUMED THAT AT A LATER STAGE IN NEGOTIATIONS, THE GROUP OF 11 WOULD WISH TO EXPAND THE CATEGORY OF DIRECT PARTICIPANTS, THIS POSSIBILITY COULD BE FULLY DEALT WITH BY THE ENLARGEMENT FORMULA. THE ALLIED STATEMENTS, ON THE OTHER HAND, WERE DISCRIMINATORY AGAINST HUNGARY BECAUSE HUNGARY WAS SINGLED OUT.

22. THE US REP REPLIED THAT HE AND THE NETHERLANDS REP HAD MADE IT CLEAR ON PREVIOUS OCCASIONS THAT THERE WAS NO EASY WAY TO AVOID MENTIONING HUNGARY. THE ALLIED REPS HAD PREVIOUSLY MENTIONED TWO

WAYS TO SOLVE THE HUNGARIAN PROBLEM WITHOUT MENTIONING HUNGARY AND MIGHT MENTION ANOTHER IN THE NEAR FUTURE, BUT UNLESS THESE PROPOSALS WERE ACCEPTED, THEN OTHERS, WHICH SPECIFICALLY MENTIONED HUNGARY, WOULD HAVE TO BE ACCEPTED AS A NECESSARY PART OF THE PACKAGE. THE ENLARGEMENT FORMULA WAS NOT SUFFICIENT TO COVER ALL ASPECTS OF THE PROBLEM. AN ENLARGEMENT FORMULA COULD BE CONSIDERED, BUT THE ALLIED REPRESENTATIVES WOULD CONTINUE TO INSIST THAT STATEMENTS ON HUNGARY ALSO BE CONSIDERED.

23. KHESTOV SAID THAT THE STATEMENTS PROPOSED BY THE ALLIES DID NOT REFLECT THE EASTERN POSITION THAT HUNGARY SHOULD NOT BE INCLUDED AS A DIRECT PARTICIPANT, BUT ON THE CONTRARY, WAS AN ALLIED EFFORT TO INCLUDE HUNGARY WITHOUT INCLUDING ITALY. HE AGREED COMPLETELY WITH THE HUNGARIAN REP THAT THIS WAS A NON-PRODUCTIVE ROUTE TO FOLLOW, AND ONE THAT WAS NOT NEUTRAL SINCE IT REPRESENTED AN EFFORT TO INCLUDE ONE COUNTRY IN FUTURE AGREEMENTS FOR THE BENEFIT OF ONLY ONE SIDE.

24. THE NETHERLANDS REP NOTED THAT THE HUNGARIAN REP HAD JUST CALLED THE PROPOSED STATEMENTS A FUTILE EXERCISE. THIS WAS INCORRECT. IT WAS IMPORTANT FOR THE ALLIES TO STATE CLEARLY WHAT THEIR CONCEPTS WERE REGARDING THE QUESTION OF EVENTUAL HUNGARIAN PARTICIPATION. THIS MATTER WAS CLEARLY HANDLED IN THE PROPOSED STATEMENTS. THE NETHERLANDS REP CONTINUED THAT EASTERN PROPOSALS ON ENLARGEMENT WOULD HAVE TO BE SCRUTINIZED BY THE ALLIES AGAINST THE LEGITIMATE CONCEPTS EMBODIED IN THEIR PROPOSED STATEMENTS. AS FOR THE EASTERN REMARK THAT THE PROPOSED STATEMENTS SOUGHT TO PREDETERMINE THE INCLUSION OF HUNGARY, THIS WAS A SUBJECT THAT  
SECRET

PAGE 04 VIENNA 02845 04 OF 06 091044 Z

COULD BE ADDRESSED IN TEXTUAL DRAFTING. HE CONCLUDED WITH THE OBSERVATION THAT SO FAR, THE PRESENT DISCUSSION HAD NOT BEEN A PRODUCTIVE ONE.

25. THE HUNGARIAN REP SAID THAT HE WAS SURPRISED TO SEE THE SAME TEXT OF STATEMENTS APPEAR AGAIN, WITH NO CHANGES FROM THE PREVIOUS VERSIONS. THE US REP REPLIED THAT HE AND THE NETHERLANDS REP WOULD INSIST ON SUCH STATEMENTS, AND THAT NO CHANGES WERE EVIDENT IN THE ALLIED DRAFT SINCE THE EASTERN SIDE HAD NOT SOUGHT TO ADDRESS THE MATTER IN A SERIOUS OR SUBSTANTIVE FASHION. THE HUNGARIAN REP SAID THAT PERHAPS COMMENTS BY THE ALLIED REP ON THE ENLARGEMENT FORMULA WOULD HELP IN THIS RESPECT. THE US REP REPLIED THAT IT MIGHT TELL, AND THAT THE PROPOSED STATEMENT WOULD BE RETURNED TO FOR CONTINUING AND SERIOUS CONSIDERATION IN THE COURSE OF FUTURE DISCUSSIONS.

26. THE ALLIED REPS THEN CIRCULATED A THREE-COLUMN WORKING PAPER ON THE EASTERN ENLARGEMENT FORMULA, INCLUDING IN ONE COLUMN THE EASTERN

SECRET

ADP000

PAGE 01 VIENNA 02845 05 OF 06 091059 Z

15

ACTION MBFR-03

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 IO-12 ADP-00 CIAE-00 PM-09 H-02 INR-10

L-03 NSAE-00 NSC-10 PA-03 RSC-01 PRS-01 SS-15 USIA-12

NEA-10 GAC-01 TRSE-00 SAJ-01 OIC-04 AEC-11 ACDA-19

OMB-01 RSR-01 NIC-01 INRE-00 AECE-00 /156 W

----- 016224

P R 090810 Z APR 73

FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 8379

INFO SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY HELSINKI

AMEMBASSY LONDON

AMEMBASSY MOSCOW

USMISSION NATO

USNMR SHAPE

USLOSACLANT

USCINCEUR

USDOCOSOUTH

USDEL SALT TWO II

USMISSION GENEVA

S E C R E T SECTION 5 OF 6 VIENNA 2845

TEXT CIRCULATED ON APRIL 5, AND IN ANOTHER COLUMN A PROPOSED ALLIED REVISION. TEXT OF PROPOSED ALLIED REVISION APPROVED IN AD HOC GROUP EARLIER SAME DAY FOLLOWS. BEGIN TEXT: IF ANOTHER STATE HAVING TERRITORY OR FORCES IN CENTRAL EUROPE WISHES TO BE INCLUDED AMONG THE DIRECT PARTICIPANTS LISTED IN THIS PARAGRAPH, IT MAY BE SO INCLUDED. SUCH INCLUSION IN NEGOTIATIONS OR DECISIONS RELATED TO CENTRAL EUROPE COULD EITHER BE GENERAL OR, IF SO AGREED, COULD BE FOR THE LIMITED PURPOSE OF TAKING PART IN A PARTICULAR DECISION OR DECISIONS RELATED TO THIS SUBJECT. THE QUESTION OF WHETHER AND TO WHAT EXTENT COUNTRIES WITH TERRITORY OR FORCES IN CENTRAL EUROPE WILL PARTICIPATE IN FUTURE AGREEMENTS OR MEASURES IS NOT PREJUDICED BY THE STATUS AGREED DURING THESE CONSULTATIONS. END TEXT.

SECRET

PAGE 02 VIENNA 02845 05 OF 06 091059 Z

27. THE NETHERLANDS REP INTRODUCED THE ALLIED REVISIONS BY SAYING THAT HIS SIDE HAD NOT DECIDED WHETHER IT WAS DESIRABLE TO INCLUDE SUCH A FORMULA, AND THAT THE PROPOSED STATEMENTS ON

HUNGARY APPEARED TO HIM TO BE A MORE SUITABLE METHOD OF DEALING WITH THE PROBLEM. HE ADDED THAT IT SHOULD BE UNDERSTOOD THAT THE ENLARGEMENT FORMULA MUST BE CONSIDERED IN PARALLEL WITH THE PROPOSED STATEMENTS ON HUNGARY. HE THEN EXPLAINED THE BASIS FOR TEXTUAL REVISIONS PROPOSED BY THE ALLIED REPS. FIRST, THE ALLIED REPS SUGGESTED THAT THE TERM " ANOTHER STATE" BE USED INSTEAD OF " OTHER STATES." " ANOTHER STATE" ESTABLISHED A GENERAL RULE AND WAS NOT RESTRICTED TO A SINGLE STATE. THE ALLIED REPS HAD FURTHER ADDED THE CONCEPT THAT IF ANOTHER STATE " HAVING TERRITORY OR FORCES IN CENTRAL EUROPE" WISHED TO BE INCLUDED AMONG DIRECT PARTICIPANTS, IT MIGHT BE SO INCLUDED BY CONSENSUS OF DIRECT PARTICIPANTS. THIS FORMULA, THE ALLIED REPS BELIEVED, WILL CLARIFY THE SITUATION WITHOUT PREJUDICE, AND WAS A FURTHER DESIRABLE WAY OF INDICATING THAT THE FUTURE NEGOTIATIONS WOULD BE FOCUSED ON CENTRAL EUROPE. THE PHRASE " IF ANOTHER STATE... WISHES" WAS SUGGESTED TO INDICATE THAT THE ACT REQUIRED THE VOLITION OF THE STATE CONCERNED, AS REPEATEDLY SUGGESTED BY AMBASSADOR USTOR. FURTHER, THE ALLIED REPS HAD MADE SOME MINOR CHANGES IN THE EASTERN LANGUAGE TO MAKE SOMEWHAT MORE CLEAR THAT INCLUSION IN " NEGOTIATIONS OR DECISIONS RELATED TO CENTRAL EUROPE" COULD EITHER BE OF A GENERAL NATURE, OR COULD BE LIMITED TO PARTICIPATION IN AN INDIVIDUAL DECISION OR DECISIONS. FINALLY, THE ALLIED REPS HAD ADDED A FINAL SENTENCE WHICH WITHOUT PREJUDICING THE RIGHTS OF ANY STATE OR MENTIONING ANY STATE BY NAME INDICATED THAT THE STATUS OF STATES WHICH HAVE TERRITORY OR FORCES IN CENTRAL EUROPE AGREED IN THESE CONSULTATIONS WOULD NOT PREJUDICE WHETHER OR NOT THEY WILL PARTICIPATE IN FUTURE AGREEMENTS. THIS WAS A NON- PREJUDICIAL APPROACH WHICH KEPT OPEN THE HUNGARIAN ISSUE.

28. KHLESTOV COMMENTED THAT, AS A FIRST IMPRESSION, CERTAIN ELEMENTS OF THE ALLIED TEXT WARRANTED FURTHER ANALYSES, WHEREAS OTHERS SEEMED CLEARLY UNPALATABLE TO THE EAST. ONE SUCH POINT WAS THE MENTION IN TWO PLACES OF THE TEXT OF THE IDEA OF FORCES OR TERRITORY IN CENTRAL EUROPE. HE THOUGHT IT HAD BEEN CLEAR FROM THE TIME THE ALLIED REPS HAD PROPOSED THIS FORMULA ON FEBRUARY 21 THAT THE EASTERN REACTION TO IT WAS A NEGATIVE ONE. THIS REACTION HAD BEEN CLEARLY STATED ON FEBRUARY 23, WHEN THE EASTERN REPS HAD EXPLAINED THAT THEY HAD IN MIND A STRATEGIC SECRET

PAGE 03 VIENNA 02845 05 OF 06 091059 Z

REGION OF CENTRAL EUROPE, WHEREAS THE ALLIED DEFINITION OF CENTRAL EUROPE WAS A PURELY GEOGRAPHIC ONE AND WAS DESIGNED FOR THE UNILATERAL ADVANTAGE OF THE WEST. THIS WAS OBVIOUSLY NOT AN EQUITABLE APPROACH. A SECOND POINT IN THE ALLIED TEXT ON ENLARGEMENT WAS THE ABSENCE OF THE CONCEPT OF NOT PREJUDICING THE SECURITY OF ANY OF THE PARTIES. WHY WAS THIS CONCEPT MISSING IN THE ALLIED TEXT? IT WAS CLEARLY A CONCEPT WHICH HAD BEEN SUPPORTED IN INTERNATIONAL DOCUMENTS INCLUDING NATO COMMUNIQUE AND BILATERAL COMMUNIQUE. HE WAS MOST SURPRISED TO SEE IT MISSING FROM THE ALLIED PAPER. KVITSINSKIY SAID THAT IT SEEMED TO HIM THAT THE ALLIED REPS HAD OMITTED THIS CONCEPT FROM THE

TEXT FOR BARGAINING PURPOSES. TIMERBAYEV ASKED BY THE ALLIED REPS HAD DROPPED THE EASTERN SENTENCE ON NOT PREJUDICING SECURITY FROM THEIR VERSION.

29. THE US REP REPLIED THAT THE ALLIED REPS HAD DONE SO BECAUSE THEY THOUGHT IT POSSIBLE THAT THE EASTERN FORMULATION, AS PART OF AN ENLARGEMENT FORMULA, MIGHT BE CITED IN THE FUTURE AGAINST POSSIBLE ALLIED EFFORTS TO RAISE THE QUESTION OF HUNGARIAN PARTICIPATION FOR DISCUSSION IN FUTURE NEGOTIATIONS. AS PHRASED, THE EASTERN FORMULA ON NOT PREJUDICING THE SECURITY OF ANY OF THE PARTIES COULD SERVE AS A WAY NOT ONLY TO PRECLUDE A DECISION ON FUTURE HUNGARIAN INVOLVEMENT, BUT EVEN AS AN ARGUMENT AGAINST RAISING THIS ISSUE IN DISCUSSION. THE HUNGARIAN REP AND ALL THREE SOVIET REPS PROCEEDED TO REPEAT THEIR SURPRISE THAT THIS EASTERN FORMULA WAS MISSING FROM THE WESTERN DRAFT. KVITSINSKIY ADDED THAT THE LAST SENTENCE OF THE ALLIED TEXT WOULD SERVE TO EXCLUDE DISCUSSION OF ITALY.

30 THE US REP REPLIED THAT THIS FORMULATION HAD NO BEARING WHATEVER ON THE QUESTION OF ITALIAN PARTICIPATION AND MERELY SERVED TO INDICATE THAT WHATEVER STATUS PARTICIPATNS WITH FORCES OR TERRITORY IN CENTRAL EUROPE HAD IN THE PRESENT CONSULTATIONS, IT WOULD NOT PREJUDICE THEIR INVOLVEMENT IN FUTURE AGREEMENTS. KVITSINSKIY SAID THAT THIS SEEMED TO HIM TO BE AN ESCAPE CLAUSE FOR GERMANY TO AVOID INVOLVEMENT IN FUTURE AGREEMENTS. THE NETHERLANDS REP REPLIED THAT IN FACT IT WAS ANALOGOUS TO THE REASONING PUT FORTH BY KHLESTOV IN AN EARLIER SESSION TO THE EFFECT THAT THE PARTICIPATION OF ALL DIRECT PARTICIPANTS, FOR EXAMPLE, LUXEMBOURG, THE U. S. AND THE U. S. S. R., NEED NOT BE EQUAL. KVITSINSKIY AGAIN RAISED THE ROLE OF ITALY, AND THE ALLIED REPS REPLIED THAT THE QUESTION OF RAISING AN ISSUE IN THE FUTURE HAD NO CONNECTION  
SECRET

PAGE 04 VIENNA 02845 05 OF 06 091059 Z

WITH THIS PART OF THE ALLIED TEXT. THIS PART OF THE TEXT WAS INTENDED TO KEEP MATTERS OPEN FOR DISCUSSION.

31. KHLESTOV RETURNED TO THE QUESTION FOR QUALIFYING DIRECT PARTICIPATION AS RELATED TO CENTRAL EUROPE, REITERATING THAT THE EASTERN VIEW OF CENTRAL EUROPE WAS A STRATEGIC RATHER THAN AS A PURELY GEOGRAPHIC ISSUE, AND THAT THE ALLIED FORMULA ON THIS SUBJECT DISREGARDED THE EASTERN STRATEGIC RATIONALE AND HENCE TOOK NO ACCOUNT OF THE EAST' S POSITION ON THE QUESTION OF HUNGARIAN PARTICIPATION.

32. THE US REP EXPLAINED THAT THE TERM " CENTRAL EUROPE" WAS USED TWICE IN THE ALLIED TEXT. IN THE FIRST INSTANCE IT SERVED TO LIMIT FUTURE ADDITIONS TO THE CATEGORY OF DIRECT PARTICIPANTS. THIS WAS LEGITIMATE SINCE THE SUBJECT MATTER OF THE TALKS WAS CENTRAL EUROPE.

SECRET

ADP000

PAGE 01 VIENNA 02845 06 OF 06 091130 Z

15

ACTION MBFR-03

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 IO-12 ADP-00 CIAE-00 PM-09 H-02 INR-10

L-03 NSAE-00 NSC-10 PA-03 RSC-01 PRS-01 SS-15 USIA-12

NEA-10 GAC-01 TRSE-00 SAJ-01 OIC-04 AEC-11 ACDA-19

OMB-01 RSR-01 NIC-01 INRE-00 AECE-00 /156 W

----- 016454

P R 090810 Z APR 73

FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 8380

INFO SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY HELSINKI

AMEMBASSY LONDON

AMEMBASSY MOSCOW

USMISSION NATO

USNMR SHAPE

USLOSACLANT

USCINCEUR

USDOCOSOUTH

USDEL SALT TWO II

USMISSION GENEVA

S E C R E T SECTION 6 OF 6 VIENNA 2845

IN THE SECOND INSTANCE, IT DID NOT HAVE THIS EFFECT, BUT WAS AN APPROPRIATE ADDITION TO THE ENLARGEMENT FORMULA SINCE IT SHOWED WITHOUT MENTIONING HUNGARY BY NAME THAT EVEN IF HUNGARY WAS NOT LISTED AS A DIRECT PARTICIPANT, THIS LISTING WOULD NOT EXCLUDE IT FROM INCLUSION IN ENLARGEMENT OF THE GROUP OF DECISION MAKERS OR IN SPECIFIC MEASURES. KVITSINSKIY SAID THAT THE ALLIED TEXT SERVED TO MAKE A CASE FOR ADDING HUNGARY OR FOR SUBTRACTING THE NETHERLANDS OR BELGIUM. THE HUNGARIAN REP SAID THAT TO HIM, THE MEANING OF THE ALLIED TEXT WAS AS FOLLOWS. ONE COUNTRY WITH TERRITORY OR FORCES IN CENTRAL EUROPE, HUNGARY, WAS GIVEN A DIFFERENT STATUS FROM THE DIRECT PARTICIPATIONS -- THIS DID NOT PREJUDGE ITS FUTURE PARTICIPATION, HOWEVER, THE US REP AGREED WITH THIS ANALYSIS, EXPLAINING THAT THE ALLIED TEXT WAS SECRET

PAGE 02 VIENNA 02845 06 OF 06 091130 Z

NOT INTENDED AND WOULD NOT SERVE TO RAISE THE QUESTION OF SUBTRACTING EITHER THE NETHERLANDS OR BELIGUM FROM THE CATEGORY OF

DIRECT PARTICIPANTS. HE ALSO EMPHASIZED THAT THIS TEXT WAS NOT AN EFFORT TO GUARD AGAINST FUTURE PARTICIPATION IN AGREEMENTS BY VARIOUS MEMBERS OF THE CATEGORY OF DIRECT PARTICIPANTS. KHLESTOV SAID THAT THE TEXT SERVED THE SAME PURPOSE AS THE ALLIED PROPOSED STATEMENTS IN TERMS OF SINGLING OUT HUNGARY, BUT DID THIS BY MEANS OF A FORMULA OF GEOGRAPHIC DEFINITION. THE NETHERLANDS REP SAID THAT HUNGARY WAS NOT SINGLED OUT -- FRANCE COULD ALSO BE CONSIDERED AS A POTENTIAL PARTICIPANT.

33. THE HUNGARIAN REP ASKED ABOUT THE PHRASE, " IF ANOTHER STATE ... WISHES TO BE INCLUDED." IF THE EASTERN REPRESENTATIVES AGREED TO SUCH A PHRASE, WOULD THERE THEN BE A NEED FOR COMPLEMENTARY STATEMENTS PROPOSED BY THE ALLIES? THE US REP REPLIED THAT HE COULD NOT ANSWER THE QUESTION AT THIS POINT, BUT THAT THE HUNGARIAN REP MIGHT WISH TO CONSIDER THIS LINE OF REASONING FURTHER. IF THERE COULD BE AN ADEQUATE AGREED STATEMENT IN THE TEXT, MANIFESTLY THERE WOULD BE NO NEED FOR STATEMENTS. THE NETHERLANDS REP REPLIED THAT IF THE IDEAS IN THE ALLIED TEXT ON ENLARGEMENT PROVED ACCEPTABLE, THE ALLIED REPS WOULD CHECK TO SEE HOW THIS WOULD EFFECT OTHER ELEMENTS OF THE ALLIED POSITION. KHLESTOV INTERJECTED THAT THE CONCEPT OF CENTRAL EUROPE AS WOVEN INTO THE ALLIED TEXT WAS NOT NEUTRAL BUT SINGLED OUT HUNGARY.

34. KHLESTOV THEN RETURNED TO THE QUESTION OF THE EASTERN PHRASE THAT ENLARGEMENT SHOULD NOT PREJUDICE THE SECURITY OF ANY OF THE PARTIES. HE SAID THAT THE EASTERN FORMULATION WOULD NOT BE RELEVANT TO THE CASE WHERE THE ALLIES WOULD RAISE THE QUESTION OF HUNGARY FOR DISCUSSION, ALTHOUGH IT WOULD BE RELEVANT TO THE QUESTION OF AGREEING ON HUNGARY'S INCLUSION.

35. THE ALLIED REPS THEN DISTRIBUTED A THREE- COLUMN WORKING PAPER RELATING TO THE FIRST SENTENCE OF THE SECOND PARAGRAPH OF THE APRIL 5 SOVIET TEXT, QUALIFYING THE CATEGORY OF DIRECT PARTICIPANTS. THE PROPOSED ALLIED VERSION OF THIS TEXT AS APPROVED IN THE AD HOC GROUP PRIOR TO THE SESSION WITH THE EAST IS AS FOLLOWS: BEGIN TEXT: REPRESENTATIVES OF THE FOLLOWING STATES HAVING TERRITORY OR FORCES IN CENTRAL EUROPE, WHICH MAY DECIDE TO PARTICIPATE IN POSSIBLE MEASURES RELATED TO CENTRAL EUROPE, SHALL TAKE PART AS DIRECT PARTICIPANTS AND TAKE THE  
SECRET

PAGE 03 VIENNA 02845 06 OF 06 091130 Z

NECESSARY DECISIONS BY CONSENSUS. END TEXT.

36. THE NETHERLANDS REP EXPLAINED THAT THE PROPOSED ALLIED TEXT TOOK ACCOUNT OF THE FACT THAT ALL OF THE 11 STATES IN THE CATEGORY HAVE FORCES OR TERRITORY IN CENTRAL EUROPE, AND THUS SAID SO. IT ALSO SAID THAT THESE ARE STATES WHICH MAY DECIDE TO PARTICIPATE IN POSSIBLE MEASURES RELATED TO CENTRAL EUROPE, THUS FURTHER DEFINING THIS CATEGORY. MOREOVER, SINCE IN THE ALLIED VIEW THE EASTERN PHRASE REFERRING TO " POSSIBLE AGREEMENTS CONCERNING THE REDUCTION

OF ARMED FORCES AND ARMAMENTS IN CENTRAL EUROPE" ANTICIPATED DISCUSSION OF AGENDA AND AN AGREED DESIGNATION OF THE SUBJECT MATTER OF THE COMING NEGOTIATIONS, THE ALLIES HAD PROPOSED A LESS THAN FAR REACHING FORMULA. FINALLY, THE ALLIED TEXT IDENTIFIED THE STATES CONCERNED AS " DIRECT PARTICIPANTS," THUS PROVIDING A CONVENIENT WAY OF REFERRING TO THEM.

37. KHLESTOV AND KVITSINSKIY CHALLENGED THE PHRASE " WHICH MAY DECIDE TO PARTICIPATE IN POSSIBLE MEASURES" ON THE GROUNDS THAT THIS COMPLETELY OPENED UP THE QUESTION OF WHO WAS A DIRECT PARTICIPANT AND WHO WAS NOT, AND THUS APPEARED TO NEGATE TWO MONTHS OF WORK IN VIENNA. THE US REP SAID THIS WAS NOT THE CASE. KHLESTOV INTERVENED, SAYING THE ALLIED TEXT DID INDEED LEAVE EVERYTHING OPEN, AND KVITSINSKIY CHALLENGED THE PHRASE " MEASURES RELATED TO CENTRAL EUROPE," ASKING WHAT MEASURES MIGHT BE ENVISAGED -- COULD THESE, FOR EXAMPLE, RELATE TO CONSIDERATION OF WASTE DISPOSAL OR AIR POLLUTION IN CENTRAL EUROPE? KHLESTOV THEN SAID THAT HE DID NOT LIKE THREE ASPECTS OF THE ALLIED TEXT: IT LEFT THE QUESTION OF WHO WAS A DIRECT PARTICIPANT OPEN; IT RELATED THIS PARTICIPATION TO CENTRAL EUROPE, WHEREAS AGREEMENT ALREADY REACHED ON THE FACT THAT THE GROUP OF DIRECT PARTICIPANTS WOULD BE 11 MADE CLEAR WHO POTENTIAL PARTICIPANTS WERE. FINALLY, THE ALLIED TEXT OMITTED THE CONCEPT OF REDUCTIONS OF ARMED FORCES AND ARMAMENTS, SUBSTITUTING IN ITS PLACE ONLY THE VAGUEST TYPE OF WORDS ABOUT POSSIBLE MEASURES. TIMERBAYEV ASKED WHY THE WORD " MEASURES" WAS USED RATHER THAN THE WORD " AGREEMENTS". THE US REP REPLIED THAT IT MIGHT BE POSSIBLE TO CONSIDER OTHER WORDS THAN " MEASURES" SUCH AS " AGREEMENTS" IF THE EASTERN SIDE COULD SIGNIFY AGREEMENTS TO OTHER POINTS IN THE TEXT. THE NETHERLANDS

REP THEN ASKED WHAT THE EASTERN REPS MEANT BY THEIR PHRASE " POTENTIAL PARTICIPANTS." KHLESTOV REPLIED THAT " POTENTIAL" MEANT THAT THESE PARTIES WOULD BECOME PARTICIPANTS IN AGREEMENTS.

SECRET

PAGE 04 VIENNA 02845 06 OF 06 091130 Z

38. THE NETHERLANDS REP SAID THAT NEGOTIATIONS WOULD INVOLVE SOVEREIGN COUNTRIES COMING TOGETHER TO DISCUSS POSSIBLE AGREEMENTS, AND THAT THE FACT THAT SOVEREIGN COUNTRIES WENT TO A NEGOTIATION WOULD NOT MEAN THAT THEY WOULD NECESSARILY TAKE PART IN AGREEMENTS. KHLESTOV SAID THAT SINCE THE CONCEPT OF SOVEREIGNTY WAS RAISED, HE WOULD BE GLAD TO SPEAK EXTENSIVELY ON THIS POINT, ON WHICH HE HAD PREVIOUSLY GIVEN A LECTURE COURSE. THE ALLIED REPS INDICATED THAT WOULD PREFER TO FOREGO THIS EDIFYING EXPERIENCE.

39. THE NEXT SESSION WAS SCHEDULED FOR APRIL 9 AT 4 P. M. IN THE U. S. EMBASSY. IT MAY BE PRECEDED BY A LUNCH BETWEEN NETHERLANDS, US, AND SOVIET REPS. HUMES

SECRET



<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** X  
**Capture Date:** 07 MAY 1999  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** n/a  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 09 APR 1973  
**Decaption Date:** 01 JAN 1960  
**Decaption Note:**  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Authority:** boyleja  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1973VIENNA02845  
**Document Source:** ADS  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** n/a  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** N/A  
**Errors:** n/a  
**Film Number:** n/a  
**From:** VIENNA  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1973/newtext/t19730460/abqcells.tel  
**Line Count:** 864  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE  
**Office:** ACTION MBF  
**Original Classification:** SECRET  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 16  
**Previous Channel Indicators:**  
**Previous Classification:** SECRET  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Reference:** n/a  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Authority:** boyleja  
**Review Comment:** n/a  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 06 SEP 2001  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review History:** WITHDRAWN <02-Aug-2001 by reddocgw, RDFRD>; RELEASED <06-Sep-2001 by boyleja>; APPROVED <10-Sep-2001 by boyleja>  
**Review Markings:**

Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
30 JUN 2005

**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Referrals:** n/a  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** <DBA CORRECTED> gwr 971216  
**Subject:** MBFR: APRIL 6 DISCUSSION BETWEEN NETHERLANDS AND US REPS AND SOVIET AND HUNGARIAN REPS ON HUNGARIAN  
ISSUE  
**TAGS:** PARM, AU  
**To:** STATE INFO SECDEF  
BONN  
HELSINKI  
LONDON  
MOSCOW  
NATO

USNMR SHAPE  
USLOSACLANT  
USCINCEUR  
USDOCOSOUTH  
SALT TWO II  
GENEVA  
**Type:** TE

**Markings:** Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005